



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,109	12/07/1999	DARRYL E. RUBIN	03797.81487	7310

28319 7590 03/25/2004

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT
1001 G STREET, N.W.
ELEVENTH STREET
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/457,109

Applicant(s)

RUBIN ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 14-15 & 17.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment B filed 12/22/2003 to the original application filed 12/07/1999; IDS filed 10/08/2003, 11/26/2003 and 01/16/2004.
2. Claims 1-21 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-2 have been amended; claims 19-21 have been added. Claims 1 and 4-5 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1-3 and 5-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following limitations recite:

- “the links” (claim 1, line 4 & claim 5, line 7)
- “the at least one respective link” (claim 1, line 6)
- “the user content document pages” (claim 5, lines 5-6)

There are insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Dependent claims are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claims.

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

Claim 1-3 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Bates et al. (U.S. 6,585,776 – filed 10/1999).

As to independent claim 1, Bates discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a computer user interface (*Abstract*) comprising:

- a plurality of document pages (*hypertext documents; col.5, lines 64-67*);
- at least two of the document pages including at least one link (*Figs 14 -15,*

includes: Introduction, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2);

- at least one of the links having a property that indicates a display format for at least a respective one of the links (*e.g. in Fig.6, links 112 and 124 have different display formats*); and

the display format of the at least one respective link being based on the property indicating the display format (*col.4, lines 28-44 & col.7, line 26 – col.8, line 22*).

Art Unit: 2176

As to dependent claim 2, Bates discloses teach the display format of the at least one respective link is based upon an examination of the content of the at least one respective link's target document (*col. 6, lines 13-44*).

As to dependent claim 3, Bates discloses at least one of the links has a property indicating the display update latency of the at least one of the links (*col. 4, lines 28-44*).

As to dependent claim 19, Bates discloses one of the links provides an association between two different spots in the document pages (*Fig. 6 and associated text*).

As to dependent claim 20, Bates discloses the two different spots are on the same page (*e.g., the contents of links 114 and 118 are displayed on page 110; see Fig. 6*).

As to dependent claim 21, Bates discloses one of the links relates a spot in a document page with an executable object (*e.g., when the user clicks on link 114, the system executes "introduction" to display its content; see Fig. 6*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bates et al.** (U.S. 6,585,776 – filed 10/1999) in view of **Danneels** (U.S. 6,038,598 – filed 02/1998).

Art Unit: 2176

As to independent claim 4, the rejection of independent claim 1 is incorporated herein in full. However, claim 4 further recites:

- in response to activation of a first link by user, navigating to a document page and display the document page in a first display format; and
- in response to activation of a second link by user, the second link being different than the first link and linking the same page linked to by the first link, navigating to the link-to document page and display the document page in a second display format, the second display format being different than the first display format .”

Danneels discloses:

- in response to activation of a first link by user(*user ... requests a web page specifying a URL; col.5, lines 5-23*), navigating to a document page and display the document page in a first display (*a web page set with English text; col.5, lines 24-46*); and
- in response to activation of a second link by user, the second link being different than the first link and linking the same page linked to by the first link, navigating to the link-to document page and display the document page in a second display format, the second display format being different than the first display format (*web page set with German text; col.5, lines 23-49*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bates and Danneels because Danneels’ teaching would have provided the capability for allowing the user to retrieve the web page displaying in his/her desired format.

As to independent claim 5 is directed to a computer readable medium for implementing the computer user interface of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, claim 5 further recites “indicating via at least one link property a display format for at least one of the links on the user content page”.

Bates does not explicitly teach “indicating via at least one link property a display format for at least one of the links on the user content pages.”

Note the discussion of claim 4 above for rejection of “indicating via at least one link property a display format for at least one of the links on the user content pages.”

As to dependent claim 6, Bates discloses displaying, in a display frame in a linked-from document page, information about a linked-to document (*Fig.6 and associated text*).

As to dependent claim 7, Bates discloses displaying, in a display frame in a linked-from document page, content of a linked to document (*e.g., the content of links 114, 118, and 122 are displaying on display frame 110, see Fig.6*).

As to dependent claim 8, Bates discloses updating the display of the linked-to content at a rate specified by a property of the link linking the linked-from and linked-to document pages (*col.9, lines 38-64*).

As to dependent claim 9, Bates discloses using heuristics to automatically provide most-likely-to-use links to additional material (*col.6, lines 21-67*).

As to dependent claim 10, Bates discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon documents previously navigated to by the user (*col.7, lines 37-43*).

Art Unit: 2176

As to dependent claim 11, Bates discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon documents having subject matter similar to a document being viewed by the user (*col.6, lines 8-44*).

As to dependent claim 12, Bates discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon documents created by an author who is the same as the author of a document being viewed by the user (*col.6, lines 8-44*).

As to dependent claim 13, Bates discloses providing at least one of the most-likely-to-use links based upon documents created during a first time period substantially the same as a time period during which a document being viewed by the user was created (*col.6, lines 8-44*).

As to dependent claim 14, Bates discloses using heuristics to automatically provide a set of command choices the user (*col.7, lines 45-67*).

As to dependent claim 15, Bates discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based upon analysis of the user's current document context (*col.6, lines 13-44*).

As to dependent claim 16, Bates discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based upon a set of commands recently invoked by the user (*col.5, line 64-col.6, line 3*).

As to dependent claim 17, Bates discloses including at least one command in the set of command choices based upon commands the user has invoked most frequently in the past from contexts substantially the same as the user's current context (*Fig.6*).

Art Unit: 2176

6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bates et al.** in view of **Danneels** and further in view of **Suzuki** (U.S. 6,266,772).

As to dependent claim 18, the combination of Bates and Danneels does not explicitly teach “displaying at least one link within an e-mail message document page, the associated link, upon activation, causing command code to be executed to perform an operation selected from the group consisting of: reply, reply to all, forward, and delete.”

Suzuki discloses displaying at least one link within an e-mail message document page, the associated link, upon activation, causing command code to be executed to perform an operation selected from the group consisting of: reply, reply to all, forward, and delete (*col. 7, lines 6-30 & col. 13, lines 36-61*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Danneels’ teachings in the system of Bates as modified by Suzuki because it would have provided the capability for submitting an application to a WWW-contents opening certification organization in writing or through communication means such as electronic mail beforehand.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant’s arguments filed 12/22/2003 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Examiner believes that the newly applied prior art discloses the limitations as claimed by Applicant.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kanerva et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,122,649	issue dated: Sep. 19, 2000
Fogg et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,163,778	issue dated: Dec.19, 2000
Knowles	U.S Patent No. 6,370,497	issue dated: Apr. 9, 2002
Saxton et al.	U.S Patent No. 6,457,013	issue dated: Sep. 24, 2002
Fujimura	U.S Patent No. 6,697,997	issue dated: Feb. 24, 2004

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
March 19, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER